

### REMARKS

Claims 12-23 and 25-30 are pending in the application.

#### Personal Interview

Applicants appreciate Examiner Hick and Examiner Beck's time and effort in conducting a personal interview with Applicants' representative, Maki Hatsumi, on December 8, 2010 in connection with the above-identified application.

During the interview, Applicants' representative emphasized that in the present invention:

- i) The programmable display apparatus, which is connected to control target equipment, provides "a plurality of instructions" to the control target equipment to *trigger* the equipment to operate;
- ii) The control target equipment has a program preinstalled therein, and operates without receiving the program from the display apparatus; and
- iii) The display apparatus does not provide the program to the target equipment,

and that, in contrast, in the Ghercioiu reference (US 2004/0010734):

- i) The computer system 102 (corresponds to the "programmable display apparatus"), which is connected to a target embedded device 110 (corresponds to the "control target equipment"), provides a program for operating the embedded device 110;
- ii) The embedded device 110 does not have a program preinstalled therein, and operates only after the program is provided by the computer system 102; and
- iii) The computer system 102 is capable of generating the program, and the generated program is provided to the embedded device 110.

Applicants' representative also emphasized that the "instructions" in the present invention are just a signal that triggers the control target equipment, and are different from a

“program” of the Ghercioiu reference, which is used to operate the target embedded device in an intended manner.

The Examiners indicated that the claim 12, as amended in the Reply August 27, 2010, does not clearly distinguish over the Ghercioiu reference.

In view of this, Applicants’ representative proposed amending claim 12 to claim:  
wherein said programmable display apparatus monitors and displays the state of said control target apparatus without providing a program from the display apparatus to said control target apparatus.

In response, Examiner Beck suggested amending the phrase “a program” to --any program-- to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the Ghercioiu reference. Applicants’ representative agreed.

In view of the foregoing discussion, independent claims 12 and 23 of the present application have been amended, as agreed upon, to distinguish the claimed invention over the Ghercioiu reference.

With regard to the rejections of claims 23 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, the Examiners have agreed that the rejection can be overcome by incorporating the term --non-transitory-- (i.e., A non-transitory computer-readable recording medium . . . ) in the preamble of each claim. In view of this, these claims have been amended, as agreed upon, to overcome this rejection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the foregoing amendments to the pending claims and determine that the claimed invention is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 23 and 28-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In view of this, the rejected claims have been amended to overcome this rejection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

(a) Claims 12-23, 25-26, and 28-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghercioiu et al. (US 2004/0010734) in view of Hasako et al. (US 2003/0093715). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above in the Personal Interview section, independent claims 1 and 23 have been amended, as agreed upon by the Examiners and Applicants' representative to overcome this rejection.

More specifically, claim 12 has been amended to claim:

storage means for storing symbol data for displaying a plurality of symbols related to each of a plurality of instructions executed by said control target equipment;

.....

wherein said programmable display apparatus monitors and displays the state of said control target apparatus without providing any program from the programmable display apparatus to said control target apparatus.

In the present invention, the programmable display apparatus does not provide any program to the control target apparatus for operating the apparatus in an intended manner. The "instructions" executed by the control target equipment are just a signal that triggers the control

target apparatus to operate. In contrast, Ghercioiu has a host computer that provides a “program” to a target embedded device, so that the target embedded device operates in an intended manner.

Accordingly, Ghercioiu does not monitor and display “the state of said control target apparatus without providing any program from the programmable display apparatus to said control target apparatus,” as recited in claim 12.

The Hasako reference has been relied upon to show that the “relation means” and the “second display control means” are known in the art.

Further, the Keele reference has been relied upon to show that the “control means” that displays the moving image of at least one of a time period from a predetermined time previous to the detection and a time period to a predetermined time after the detection is known in the art.

In view of this, Applicants submit that even assuming that Ghercioiu, Hasako, and Keele can be combined, which Applicants do not admit, the cited references, taken singly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “wherein said programmable display apparatus monitors and displays the state of said control target apparatus without providing any program from the programmable display apparatus to said control target apparatus,” as recited in claim 12.

Claims 13-22 and 25-26, variously dependent on claim 12, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 12.

Claim 23 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 12.

Claims 28 and 29, variously dependent on claim 23, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 23.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claims 27 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghercioiu in view of Hasako and Keele et al. (US 2005/0086695), and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 27, indirectly dependent on claim 12, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 12.

Claim 30, indirectly dependent on claim 23, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 23.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

#### Conclusion


Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi, Registration No. 40417 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: December 28, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By  (reg. # 40,417)  
for Charles Gorenstein  
Registration No.: 29271  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
703-205-8000